

November 8, 2022

LORI KLETZER
Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

RE: Formal Review of Proposed Revisions to CAPM 516.000 - Unit 18 Titles

Dear Lori,

The Academic Senate has received the request for formal campus review of the Proposed Revisions to Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) 516.000 - Unit 18 Titles. The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed the proposed revisions and provided comment; that response is enclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this campus policy.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "P. Gallagher" with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Patty Gallagher, Chair
Academic Senate

Enc: CPB_re_ProposedRev.CAPM516.000

cc: Grace McClintock, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Stefano Profumo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
David Cuthbert, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
Catherine Jones, Chair, Committee on Teaching
Onuttom Narayan, Chair, Privilege and Tenure
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate

November 4, 2022

Patty Gallagher, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Review of Proposed Revisions to CAPM 516.000: Unit 18 Titles

Der Patty,

On October 20, 2022, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposed revisions to CAPM 516.000-Unit 18 Titles. Though CPB understood that the changes were so wide ranging as to make it difficult to provide a redlined copy, the link provided to the original policy was dead, making it difficult to provide our own comparative analysis. CPB therefore reviewed the policy from the perspective of clarity: Did the policy language provide transparent and clear policies to administrators, faculty, staff, and lecturers on the timeline, steps, decision flow, and requirements for hiring, review, and advancement processes? CPB's conclusion was that the policy was clear.

CPB does flag the possibility for more explicit diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) policy as it pertains to recruitment, review, and advancement. CPB notes the narrative application for the Bronze Award as for the SEA Change Initiative of the AAAS states:

It is notable that unlike most institutions, our Senate faculty are actually more diverse than our lecturers. We have been much more intentional about changing recruitment and retention practices for our Senate faculty than for our lecturers, and thus an action item below is to bring a new focus to our lecturers. We recognize that issues around compensation, job security, and benefits make this a challenging endeavor given the local cost of living. The newly ratified U18 contract does make some steps towards addressing these issues, but further action will be needed in order for this campus to make strides comparable to those of our Senate faculty. There has been no equity study for lecturer compensation. For our Senate faculty, our campus regularly performs a salary equity study. These studies have consistently found that there are large salary differences between disciplines (e.g., astrophysicists have higher average salaries than biologists), but that our campus does not have salary discrepancies by gender or ethnicity once discipline has been controlled for (Page 20).

CPB wonders if there might be an expectation after the competency assessment where DEI can be more explicitly factored in. For example, 1) might there be an expectation for additional materials, such as a statement on contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion through teaching, or 2) could the standard of "teaching effectiveness" that determines reappointment be more strongly linked to "academic responsibility" with an assessment of contributions to student accessibility. Lastly, 3) might greater-than-normal promotion standards have some examples that include contributions to DEI?

Sincerely,



Dard Neuman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: CAP Chair Profumo
CEP Chair Cuthbert
COT Chair Jones
P&T Chair Narayan